

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed from the United States Patent and Trademark Office on December 15, 2004, the Examiner objected to claims 13, 14 and 31, and rejected claims 1-12, 15-30 and 32-34. Claim 2 is cancelled in this response. Therefore, claims 1 and 3-34 remain pending in this application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

A. Breeding

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 11, 12, 15, 17-21, 26-29, 32 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,829,874 to Breeding. Applicants respectfully traverse. The standard for a Section 102 rejection is set forth in M.P.E.P 706.02, which provides:

“... for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present.”

Claim 1 has been amended to include, “an opposing arm coupled to said supporting rib, wherein said **opposing arm is substantially differently shaped than the stabilizing arm**”. And likewise claim 19 has been amended to include, “wherein said **opposing arm is substantially differently shaped than the stabilizing arm**”. And claim 32 has been amended to include, “wherein the substantially rigid shoulder frame includes **two differently shaped shoulder support members**”. Support for these limitations can be found in claims 14 and 31, and Figures 1, 5, and 7 of the original application. Breeding clearly teaches a conventional stabilizing arm (52) and an opposing arm (54) of the same general shape. Therefore, for at least this reason, the

rejection of claims 1, 19, and 32 should be withdrawn. Claims 2-8, 11, 12, 15, 17-18, 20-21, 26-29, and 33 are dependent from claims 1, 19, or 32 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

B. Barry

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 16, 19, 22-25, 30 and 32-34 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 493,348 to Barry et al.. Applicants respectfully traverse.

As discussed above, Claims 1, 19 and 32 have been amended to include a limitation relating to the different shape between the stabilizing arm and opposing arm. Barry clearly teaches a conventional stabilizing arm and an opposing arm of the same general shape. Therefore, for at least this reason, the rejection of claims 1, 19, and 32 should be withdrawn. Claims 2, 9, 10, 16, 22-25, 30 and 33-34 are dependent from claims 1, 19, or 32 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

Allowable Subject Matter

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 13, 14, and 31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 13 has been rewritten into independent form to include the original limitations of claims 1, 2, 11, and 12, and therefore should be allowable. Claim 14 has also been rewritten into independent form to include the original limitations of claims 1, 2, 11, and 12, and therefore should be allowable. Claim 31 has been rewritten into independent form to include the original limitations of claims 19, 28, 29, and 30, and therefore should be allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that the amendments made herein do not add new matter and that the claims are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request favorable reconsideration. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this communication, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

DATED this 10 day of March, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael H. Krieger
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 35,232

KIRTON & McCONKIE
1800 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Telephone: (801) 321-4814
Facsimile: (801) 321-4893

THB/LC
802799